



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

scarcely found a place (cp. *furnieren*, to veneer, 381, 29). It would be a most interesting and valuable work to write eventually a supplementary volume of "Fremdwörter in the German Language" on the same plan as the "Sachwörterbuch." It is beyond doubt that educated people would highly welcome such an addition, and let us hope that Professor Sattler may find time and leisure to accomplish this difficult task. Yet even without such a supplement, the "Sachwörterbuch" cannot fail to meet with universal appreciation.

KLARA HECHTENBERG COLLITZ.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

GEORGES PELLISSIER : *Études de Littérature et de Morale contemporaines*. Paris : Ed. Cornély et Cie, 1905.

The qualities of the almost ideal critic which we have learned to appreciate a long time since in Mr. Pellissier, those qualities which have contributed to the great success of his two volumes on the "Mouvement littéraire" in the nineteenth century, and which make his text-book on the History of French literature the best that can be put in the hands of our students, will be found again in his newly published work. But, as for many other men of letters in France, a change is noticeable since the last publication by the same author. Before, literature was the chief object of Mr. Pellissier. His books were only "Études de littérature contemporaine"; this one is called "Études de littérature et de morale contemporaines." He had his word to say about the recent events in France, as they were reëchoed in literature or elsewhere. In impartiality, soundness, nobleness, his views as expressed here, rank second to no one else among his contemporaries and countrymen.

Though, if one allows oneself to be guided by reason alone, it is difficult in general not to accept his views, I do not mean to say that every one will agree in every particular point with Mr. Pellissier; most of the time, however, disagreements will turn out to be mere questions of nuance.

One of Mr. Pellissier's favorite ideas—one which

he had developed already at length in his "Mouvement littéraire contemporain"—is that literary schools no longer exist in France, and never will exist again. (Cf. the first essay in the book, and *passim*.) But I am afraid that in arguing the point he has perhaps suggested to some of his readers, conclusions which he himself had not in mind. At any rate, the word "School" is misleading. A critic explains to the public the literary features which are characteristic of an epoch; with this purpose in view, he groups elements appearing sporadically and separately in different writers, but they very seldom apply together to any individual author; or else it is in a way so indefinite and vague that it can no longer be considered a specific description of a man. In other terms, those characteristics thus grouped are those of the epoch, not of the authors, and the authors are simply under the influence of their time. In Romanticism there are men as different as Vigny, Hugo, Musset, in Naturalism as Daudet and Zola, in Parnassism as Coppée and Sully-Prudhomme, and so on. Those men work under similar circumstances; that is all. There is no school. Who would you call really a pupil of Victor Hugo? Therefore, I should consider the question of the existence of literary schools as dependent upon the conditions and aspirations of the epoch which they reflect. And as we are still changing our social ideals, as *e. g.*, the pendulum will probably continue to swing back and forth for quite a while yet between idealism and realism, literary movements or tendencies will inevitably follow.

This much must probably be granted to the contentions of Mr. Pellissier that, thanks to our learning which has broadened our power of appreciation, we are able to enjoy—or even to produce—art of any kind. For example, we will appreciate a work of Classical form and inspiration though it is not now in keeping with our natural preoccupation and ideals.

The same subject is treated in No. XII, *Sainte-Beuve et Taine et la critique contemporaine*. This was written for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Sainte-Beuve's birth. Though admiring Taine, Pellissier cannot help seeing in him a representative of dogmatism, and therefore thinks that Saint-Beuve is much superior after all. One confuses, he says, *esprit philosophique* and *esprit*

de système. The second is likely to lead astray—Taine was a victim of it; the first is safe and legitimate—Sainte-Beuve was a master in applying it to literature. The conclusion (p. 179) is very strong: “Du système de Taine rien ne restera que ce qui provenait de Sainte-Beuve. Il nous faut maintenant reprendre les choses où Sainte-Beuve les avait laissées, en débarrassant la critique du dogmatisme spécieux et stérile auquel Taine et ses disciples l’ont trop longtemps asservie.” Perhaps too strong! There are in our way of thinking, periods of doubt and periods of belief; the first will be reflected in criticism (as elsewhere) by authors showing the *esprit philosophique*, the other by authors showing the *esprit de système* or dogmatism. This or that will be in turn considered legitimate. Just now we are in a period of doubt; dogmatists are strangers among us. But who can say how long this will last?

The foregoing are questions of theory. As soon as it comes to the application of sound critical principles, there is nothing to keep us from admiring in Mr. Pellissier a wonderful example of a well-balanced mind. His Essays on Albalat “L’art d’écrire et les corrections des grands écrivains” (No. III), “Le paysan dans notre littérature moderne” (x), “Les ‘vierges fortes’ de M. Marcel Prevost” (xi), “George Sand” (xv), “Universités populaires” (xvii), will remain as models of sound argumentation. Let me mention also the essay on Madame de Noailles, “A propos du ‘Visage émerveillé’” (xx), which is a jewel of forcible and delightful irony—terribly deserved by the modern précieuse!

I should like to call attention particularly to two studies on style. One of them, “La langue littéraire moderne” (xiv), examines the contribution of the more recent generations to the French vocabulary and style. The other, “Le Style noble et la Tragédie classique” (vi), is a most remarkably fascinating and minute study of the question of Classicism and Romanticism from the point of view of style. Thus viewed this old subject is completely renewed; to such a degree that it may be to many almost a revelation. Every student of French literature knew that the facts were there; nobody yet had taken the trouble to really work them out. As a reference for private reading for our college students, this essay will be invaluable.

Let us now say a few words as to the attitude of Mr. Pellissier before the events of recent years in France. Two essays show by their titles alone the preoccupations of the author in writing them. “L’affaire Dreyfus et la littérature française” (iv), and “‘Vérité’ d’Émile Zola” (xvi). (Cf. also viii, “L’École sans Dieu,” and xvii, “Universités populaires.”) As to the question of principles, it is treated in two lectures that were first given in the “Grande Salle de l’Université” in Geneva, Switzerland. They are: “Voltaire philosophe” (xix), and “La conversion de M. Ferdinand Brunetière” (xxii). Mr. Pellissier has picked out the two men who seem to him to impersonate best the two sides of the intellectual France of to-day. Voltaire is the man who had tried to free France from whatever appeared accidental both in religion and ethics, viz.: superstition, intolerance and dogmatism. He had prepared the way to our modern individualism in thought: society is there for the individual and not the reverse. Brunetière is the representative of the spirit of reaction on religious and moral grounds; with an indisputable dialectic power, he tries to convince us that we ought to submit the individual to social powers. He recoils before no consequences; he puts before the men of the twentieth century as a fundamental truth the famous word of Bossuet: “L’hérétique, c’est celui qui a une opinion,” and, when his fellow men, unable to understand a writer of his attainments taking such a position, ask him to state exactly what he believes, he answers simply: “Allez le demander à Rome.” On one point both Voltaire and Brunetière agree: they make metaphysical and religious beliefs to depend upon ethics. Voltaire seems to be the more logical of the two when he accepts religious doctrines only in so far as they are necessary to support morality. Brunetière, on the other hand, seeing that in this way religion is necessarily taken down from its throne, is afraid of the consequences; thus he suddenly and slyly leaves the theoretical for the practical ground in order to continue the discussion. Men, he says, need an authority; for they are not good enough to be allowed to rely upon themselves in their actions. As Bossuet in the seventeenth century claimed that Protestantism was anarchy, Brunetière to-day shows that democracy or individualism is anarchy and threatens the founda-

tions of society : therefore, we must go back to authority ; and the Church is the power that can be trusted. Finally comes Mr. Pellissier, who pitilessly exposes Brunetière's arguments. In fact, he says, Brunetière only refuses liberty and individualism because he does not see good results ; but implicitly and even occasionally he recognizes openly its superiority. Now, there is another road open : Let us suffer, if necessary, and be superior ; and let us hope too—all the chances have not been exhausted anyway. I cannot reproduce here in full the beautiful and firm argumentation of Mr. Pellissier. I will rather add one or two quotations :

On page 320, "Donc parceque nos pères ont été catholiques, nous serons tenus de l'être, même quand notre raison et notre conscience y répugnent ! N'est-ce pas ravalier la religion que de la subordonner ainsi aux hasards de la naissance, que d'en faire quelque chose d'héréditaire comme une maison ou un champ ?"

Speaking of the same question elsewhere he has this striking image (p. 122) : "Un chef fidjéen, suivi d'une longue file de guerriers, grimpait un sentier de montagne. Il butta et tomba. Aussitôt tous ses hommes buttèrent et tombèrent. Un seul continua de monter. Et les autres l'assaillirent : 'Tu crois donc, s'écriaient-ils, valoir mieux que le chef !' Devons-nous, comme les indigènes de Fidji, témoigner notre respect à ceux qui nous précédèrent en répétant leurs chutes ?" . . .

The last quotation illustrates the moment when Mr. Pellissier, after the refutation of Brunetière's views, takes in his turn the offensive ; he loses no time and no word, his blows come swift and hard : (pp. 346-47.)

"Le catholicisme, enfin, c'est un gouvernement, —et le protestantisme est une anarchie. Formule à effet, que dément l'observation et qui ne soutient pas l'examen. . . . Tout protestant étant pape, comme dit Voltaire, tout protestant doit être roi ; tout protestant, comme citoyen égal à ses concitoyens, doit avoir sa part de la souveraineté nationale. Bien des fois M. Brunetière s'est déclaré démocrate. Qu'entendait-il donc par là ? Et pourquoi veut-il maintenant faire de *démocratie* et d'*anarchie* deux termes synonymes ?

Si la religion protestante n'est pas une anarchie, encore moins serait-elle une religion aristocratique. Ici même,¹ M. Brunetière prononçait voilà deux ans, son *Discours sur l'œuvre de Calvin* dans lequel il reproche à la Réforme d'avoir aristocratisé le catholicisme. On peut lui opposer "les républicains de Genève, les puritains d'Écosse ou d'Angleterre, les presbytériens d'Amérique" et tant d'autres encore. Mais répond-il "de quelque nom qu'on les nomme ce sont là des élites." Des élites—je retiens le mot ; et, retournant, ce mot

contre lui, je prétends que ce qu'il y a de plus démocratique dans la religion protestante, c'est justement qu'elle fait, de toute une nation, *une élite*. Oui, les protestants sont en un certain sens des aristocrates, si l'on entend par là comme l'expliquait M. Brunetière, que, devant "se rendre compte à eux-mêmes des raisons raisonnées de leur croyance, ils n'y arrivent qu'en acquérant du même coup une science qui les élève au dessus du vulgaire." Les protestants sont des aristocrates ; seulement, ces "aristocrates" ayant tous acquis la supériorité intellectuelle que M. Brunetière veut bien leur reconnaître, forment entre eux une démocratie ; et, quant à moi, je ne vois rien de plus beau qu'une démocratie d'aristocrates."

The argumentation having reached this point, it is probably more a question of temperament than anything else that will cause individual people to decide. A pessimist will be on Mr. Brunetière's side, an optimist on Mr. Pellissier's.

A. SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A CORRECTION.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS :—In *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xx, 191-2, Dr. U. Lindelöf takes exception to a statement made by Dr. C. Alphonso Smith in his cogent review of my dissertation on *The Inflection of the English Present Plural Indicative with Special Reference to the Northern Dialect* (Baltimore, 1903) :

"On p. 36 Dr. Rodeffer mentions the view of Sweet, Murray, and Bülbiring that the inflectional -s of the Northern third singular and the indicative plural is due to the transition of *þ* to *s*, and says that suspicion is cast on this explanation because its advocates can cite no analogous processes. He continues : 'But there are other facts that tend to cast suspicion on the correctness of this view. The organic transition from *þ* to *s* would explain the plurals in -as but not those in -es, an inflection that occurs frequently in both the indicative and the imperative plurals in the *Durham Ritual* and the *Lindisfarne Gospels* . . . With these *es*-plurals should be associated the plurals in -eþ, common to all the Early Northern texts. Since these texts were written at a period antedating the weakening of *a* to *e* in inflectional syllables, these plurals in -eþ and -es were probably formed on the analogy of the -eþ and -es of the third singular.' So far as I know, Dr. Rodeffer is the first to note this apparent defect

¹ M. Brunetière had also been called to lecture on Calvin before the University of Geneva. It was during the winter of 1902-3.